



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,863	11/26/2003	Jason P. Chalecki	MS1-1699US	9696
22801	7590	08/23/2006	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			SAIN, GAUTAM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
DATE MAILED: 08/23/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/723,863

Applicant(s)

CHALECKI ET AL.

Examiner

Gautam Sain

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2003.
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 8/06,
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 5/06,
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/03, 4/04, 6/04, 11/04, 4/05, 1/06, 3/06, 4/06,
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is a NonFinal rejection.
2. Effective filing date is 6/30/2003.
3. Claims 1-45 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 4.1 **Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nussbaum (US 6779154, filed Feb 2000), in view of Crandall, SR. et al (US 20020198935, published Dec 2002).**

Regarding independent claims 1, 21, 26, 33, 37 and 41, Nussbaum teaches *receiving an instruction to open an XML document; searching the XML document to locate a processing instruction containing a href attribute that points to a URL; discovering a solution using the URL in the processing instruction; opening the XML document with the solution, wherein the XML document can be inferred from the XML schema and portions of the XML document are logically coupled with fragments of the XML schema; and executing the XSLT presentation application to render a HTML electronic form containing data-entry fields associated with the coupled portions.* For example, Nussbaum discloses an arrangement for reversibly converting XML documents to HTML documents that includes an XML parser for parsing the XML documents stored in

the XML document data base and selectively executing operations as specified by the parsed XML document by executing a corresponding set of executable functions based on the rule set for the corresponding operation (col 5, line 66- col 6, line 15). A context module is configured for generating linking information within the application runtime for an XML object referenced within a given XML page, including generating a URL that specifies the location information (col 7, lines 8-16) which the examiner interprets as equivalent to the claimed searching limitation containing an href because href is used for namespace declaration to locate a URL within the XML document, which is disclosed at col 7, line 66. The HTML conversion module resolves the XML tags and the HTML tags and uses a format module for generation of HTML compliant formatting that define certain schema, a document type definition based on formatting parameters that are generated during execution of the XML document during runtime (col 8, lines 14-23). The examiner interprets the claimed solution to include a template (see specification, paragraph 23). The examiner interprets the claimed "logically coupled" to the resolving step of Nussbaum (col 7, line 58).

Nussbaum does not expressly teach, but Crandall teaches *opening the XML document with the template that includes an XSLT*. For example, Crandall teaches a method for validating the fields of a form using XSL (paragraph 25) where the form has one or more input fields requiring input data from the client (para 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nussbaum to include validating fields of a form using XSL as taught by Crandall, providing the benefit of interactively and efficiently validating electronic files

written in specific data markup languages (Crandall, para 13) and fixing the problem that XML document lacked the capability of specifying URLs as found in HTML documents (Nussbaum, col 2, lines 66-67).

Regarding claim 2, 22, 29, 34, 38 and 42, Nussbaum does not expressly teach XSLT presentation but Crandall teaches one or more receiving, searching, examining, discovering, opening and executing the XSLT presentation that are performed by the execution of HTML electronics forms application that is different from the application used to create the HTML electronic form. Crandall discloses an Internet connection between server and client devices where the forms are marked up in HTML or XML and validated at the server and then rendered at the client device using XSL (para 15 and 25), which is equivalent to a different because the task of validating is separate from the rendering of the form.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nussbaum to include an Internet connection between server and client devices where the forms are marked up in HTML or XML and validated at the server and then rendered at the client device using XSL as taught by Crandall, providing the benefit of a more efficient method of validating fields of a form where validation occurs interactively on the server-side of a client-server transaction (Crandall, para 14).

Regarding claim 3, Nussbaum does not expressly teach, but Crandall teaches applying an XSLT stylesheet to the XML document and an HTML electronic form that includes HTML elements corresponding to data-entry fields. Crandall discloses an internet browser that renders electronic forms marked up in HTML using XSL (para 25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nussbaum to include an Internet connection between server and client devices where the forms are marked up in HTML or XML and an internet browser that renders electronic forms marked up in HTML using XSL as taught by Crandall, providing the benefit of a more efficient method of validating fields of a form where validation occurs interactively on the server-side of a client-server transaction (Crandall, para 14).

Regarding claim 4, Nussbaum suggests searching the XML document to find the first instruction in the XML document that includes a URL. The examiner interprets this claim as searching the XML document for a URL and the first one found will be the first one found. Nussbaum discloses, generating linking information (a URL) within the application runtime environment for an XML object (ie., namespace) referenced within a given XML page (col 7, lines 9-25).

Regarding claim 5, Nussbaum does not teach, but Crandall suggests a manifest of XML files used for validating user input data into the data-entry fields of the form. Crandall discloses retrieval and use of profile data in data files having a consistent naming convention and consistent data structure (para 62). The examiner interprets the discloses naming convention as equivalent to the manifest of files because a manifest maintains an index like structure to keep a list of files.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nussbaum to include retrieval and use of profile data in data files having a consistent naming convention and consistent data structure as taught by

Crandall, providing the benefit of a more efficient method of validating fields of a form where validation occurs interactively on the server-side of a client-server transaction (Crandall, para 14).

Regarding claim 6, Nussbaum does not teach coupled portions that set forth all possible XML documents for the coupled portions, however, Crandall suggests it. Crandall discloses validating the fields of the form where the end user advances to the next field of the form until the entire form is completed (para 57). The examiner interprets this disclosure as equivalent to the claimed invention because if a form has different XML files associated, they will all be processed because the entire form is processed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nussbaum to include validating the fields of the form until the entire form is completed as taught by Crandall, providing the benefit of a more efficient method of validating fields of a form where validation occurs interactively on the server-side of a client-server transaction (Crandall, para 14).

Regarding claims 7, 23, 27, 35, 39 and 44, Nussbaum teaches data-entry fields of the HTML form mapping to corresponding nodes of XML document; and receiving data input by user and outputting data in XML for viewing in HTML forms through data-entry fields. Nussbaum discloses translating information during execution of XML document into HTML documents and resolving XML tags within the text in the new HTML document for HTML compliant formatting, where the XML document is stored and later

the configuration module generates a HTML document representing a corresponding XML document (col 3, lines 50-67; col 4, lines 13-30).

Regarding claim 8, Nussbaum teach an XML schema (col 8, lines 15-20). Nussbaum does not teach validation to determine when the data input by user is invalid, but Crandall teaches it. Crandall discloses validating fields of a form and if errors are detected, the data are resent and the end user is informed with a message that the data provided for a particular field of the form was incorrect and needs to be resupplied (para 6 and 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nussbaum to include validating fields of a form and if errors are detected, the data are resent and the end user is informed with a message that the data provided for a particular field of the form was incorrect and needs to be resupplied as taught by Crandall, providing the benefit of a more efficient method of validating fields of a form where validation occurs interactively on the server-side of a client-server transaction (Crandall, para 14).

Regarding claim 9, Nussbaum does not teach, but Crandall suggests validation of data received by input for the user into data fields within a rule corresponding to the XML document, determining if data input by user is valid and requiring the user to correct the invalid data input. Crandall discloses validating fields of a form and if errors are detected, the data are resent and the end user is informed with a message that the data provided for a particular field of the form was incorrect and needs to be resupplied (para 6 and 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nussbaum to include validating fields of a form and if errors are detected, the data are resent and the end user is informed with a message that the data provided for a particular field of the form was incorrect and needs to be resupplied as taught by Crandall, providing the benefit of a more efficient method of validating fields of a form where validation occurs interactively on the server-side of a client-server transaction (Crandall, para 14).

Regarding claim 10, Nussbaum does not teach, but Crandall teaches validation rules have identity based on schema corresponding to a node. Crandall discloses as the client input data into the fields, validating the input data according to syntactical or semantic rules (para 15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nussbaum to include validating fields where client input data into the fields, validating the input data according to syntactical or semantic rules as taught by Crandall, providing the benefit of a more efficient method of validating fields of a form where validation occurs interactively on the server-side of a client-server transaction (Crandall, para 14).

Regarding claim 11, Nussbaum does not teach validation rule including an alert area display where the validation rule determines that the data received by input corresponds to the data entry field is invalid and output the alert so as to be associated with the corresponding data-entry field, but Crandall teaches it. Crandall discloses validating fields of a form and if errors are detected, the data are resent and the end user is

informed with a message that the data provided for a particular field of the form was incorrect and needs to be resupplied (para 6 and 14). The examiner interprets the message as equivalent to the claimed alert.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nussbaum to include validating fields of a form and if errors are detected, the data are resent and the end user is informed with a message that the data provided for a particular field of the form was incorrect and needs to be resupplied as taught by Crandall, providing the benefit of a more efficient method of validating fields of a form where validation occurs interactively on the server-side of a client-server transaction (Crandall, para 14).

Regarding claim 12, Nussbaum does not teach validation rule including an alert area display is output that includes an alert area display includes text containing information about the invalid data in the corresponding said data-entry field, but Crandall teaches it. Crandall discloses validating fields of a form and if errors are detected, the data are resent and the end user is informed with a message that the data provided for a particular field of the form was incorrect and needs to be resupplied (para 6 and 14). The examiner interprets the message as equivalent to the claimed alert.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nussbaum to include validating fields of a form and if errors are detected, the data are resent and the end user is informed with a message that the data provided for a particular field of the form was incorrect and needs to be resupplied as taught by Crandall, providing the benefit of a more efficient method of validating fields of

a form where validation occurs interactively on the server-side of a client-server transaction (Crandall, para 14).

Regarding claim 13, Nussbaum does not teach, but Crandall teaches each node has one or more of the validation rules associated. Crandall discloses as the client input data into the fields, validating the input data according to syntactical or semantic rules (para 15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nussbaum to include validating fields where client input data into the fields, validating the input data according to syntactical or semantic rules as taught by Crandall, providing the benefit of a more efficient method of validating fields of a form where validation occurs interactively on the server-side of a client-server transaction (Crandall, para 14).

Regarding claim 14, Nussbaum does not teach, but Crandall teaches validation rule includes requirement that is the data received by input from the user into a corresponding data-entry field is to be textual. Crandall discloses as the client input data into the fields, validating the input data according to syntactical or semantic rules (para 15) where a string TYPE=text identifies the type of data user can input is textual data (para 31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nussbaum to include validating fields where client input data into the fields, validating the input data according to syntactical or semantic rules, including text as taught by Crandall, providing the benefit of a more efficient method of validating

fields of a form where validation occurs interactively on the server-side of a client-server transaction (Crandall, para 14).

Regarding claim 15, Nussbaum does not teach, but Crandall teaches plurality of the validation rules are associated by mapping to the corresponding plurality of the nodes in the data file. Crandall discloses as the client input data into the fields, validating the input data according to syntactical or semantic rules (para 15) where a string TYPE=text identifies the type of data user can input is textual data (para 31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nussbaum to include validating fields where client input data into the fields, validating the input data according to syntactical or semantic rules, including text as taught by Crandall, providing the benefit of a more efficient method of validating fields of a form where validation occurs interactively on the server-side of a client-server transaction (Crandall, para 14).

Regarding claim 16, Nussbaum does not teach validation rule is associated by mapping a data-entry field by an entity that is script-based, but Crandall teaches it. Crandall discloses validation of data provided to a form which is referred to as client-side scripting (para 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nussbaum to include validation of data provided to a form which is referred to as client-side scripting as taught by Crandall, providing the benefit of a more efficient method of validating fields of a form where validation occurs interactively on the server-side of a client-server transaction (Crandall, para 14).

Regarding claim 17, Nussbaum suggests an event handler that determines when a real-time validation tool uses the scripting based validation rule after data received for the node is held by the data file. Nussbaum discloses resolving XML tags and HTML tags by generating distinctive namespace declarations for the XML tags having shared symbol (col 7, lines 60-67). The examiner interprets the discloses resolving as equivalent to the claimed validation because resolving ensures that the tags are not erroneously parsed and resolved to an appropriate fit.

Regarding claim 18, Nussbaum teach an XML schema (col 8, lines 15-20). Nussbaum does not teach an alert are display and how the alert area display is to appear when output. Crandall discloses validating fields of a form and if errors are detected, the data are resent and the end user is informed with a message that the data provided for a particular field of the form was incorrect and needs to be resupplied (para 6 and 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nussbaum to include validating fields of a form and if errors are detected, the data are resent and the end user is informed with a message that the data provided for a particular field of the form was incorrect and needs to be resupplied as taught by Crandall, providing the benefit of a more efficient method of validating fields of a form where validation occurs interactively on the server-side of a client-server transaction (Crandall, para 14).

Regarding claims 19, 24, 28 and 45, Nussbaum does not expressly teach, but Crandall teaches PI includes a character string of mso-InfoPathSolution. For example, Crandall teaches a method for validating the fields of a form using XSL (paragraph 25)

where the for has one or more input fields requiring input data from the client (para 14).

The examiner interprets the solution as a template.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Nussbaum to include validating fields of a form using XSL as taught by Crandall, providing the benefit of interactively and efficiently validating electronic files written in specific data markup languages (Crandall, para 13) and fixing the problem that XML document lacked the capability of specifying URLs as found in HTML documents (Nussbaum, col 2, lines 66-67).

Regarding claims 20, 25, 32, 36, 40, Nussbaum teaches computer. Nussbaum discloses a web server which is a computer (col 5, line 34, item 14).

Regarding claim 30, Nussbaum suggests the assesement of the likelihood exceeds the threshold when the PI is the first PI in the XML document that contains a URL is the first URL; and the discovering a solution comprises using the first URL to discover the solution. The examiner interprets this claim as searching the XML document for a URL and the first one found will be the first URL found. Nussbaum discloses, generating linking information (a URL) within the application runtime environment for an XML object (ie., namespace) referenced within a given XML page (col 7, lines 9-25).

Regarding claim 31, Nussbaum suggests the assessment of the likelihood exceeds the threshold when the one of a URL is a URL having a path with a suffix that is selected from the group consisting of .xsf or .xsn . The examiner interprets this claim as searching the XML document for a URL and the first one found will be the first URL found. Nussbaum discloses, generating linking information (a URL) within the

application runtime environment for an XML object (ie., namespace) referenced within a given XML page (col 7, lines 9-25).

Regarding claim 43, Nussbaum teaches discovering the solution using the URL in the processing instruction. Nussbaum discloses a context module is configured for generating linking information within the application runtime for an XML object referenced within a given XML page, including generating a URL that specifies the location information (col 7, lines 8-16) which the examiner interprets as equivalent to the claimed searching limitation containing an href because href is used for namespace declaration to locate a URL within the XML document, which is disclosed at col 7, line 66.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

GS 8/21/6
GS


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100